

DRAFT
SECTION 00100
PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

1. PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

1.1 In response to the solicitation the offerors are required to submit technical and cost proposals in accordance with the instructions herein. It is the intent of the solicitation to seek proposals from qualified offerors with experience and excellent performance ratings. The successful offeror will be selected based on the “Best Value to the Government”. Proposals will be evaluated on their own merit based upon the criteria factors listed herein, which are described in descending order of importance. The proposal should be prepared simply and economically, providing straightforward, concise delineation of capabilities to perform the contract.

1.2 **SOURCE SELECTION:** This source selection will be based upon Best Value and may result in an award being made to a higher rated, higher priced offeror where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors and where it is deemed by the Source Selection Authority that the technical superiority, overall business approach, and/or the past performance of the higher priced offer outweighs the benefits of any price difference. The Source Selection Authority, using sound business judgment, will base the source selection decision on a trade-off analysis of the proposals submitted in response to this solicitation in accordance with the evaluation factors established for this solicitation.

1.3 Each offeror is required to submit its proposal consisting of the following volumes:

Volume I – Technical Proposal (5 copies plus original)

Volume II – Cost Proposal (3 copies plus original)

Volume III – Subcontracting Plan (2 copies plus original). The Subcontracting Plan shall be submitted when requested by the Government during the Pre-Construction phase of the contract performance.

1.4 Proposal envelopes will be marked:

Date of Opening: _____

Time of Opening: _____

Proposal for: W912DR-06-R-0000

1.5 Page limits: The following page limits shall apply. These limits do not include title sheets, indices, tables of content, schedules, Performance Evaluations, or cover sheets:

Volume I - Technical Proposal: 150 pages, maximum

Volume II - Cost/Price Proposal (Section 00010, and Section 00600, Representation and Certifications), Cost realism documentation, 100 pages, maximum

Volume III – Subcontracting Plan

A page printed on both sides will be counted as two pages. Pages containing text shall be submitted on 8½” x 11” paper. Each page shall be minimally single spaced with a minimum 12-point font and one inch margins all around. Drawings or other graphics shall be reduced only to the extent legibility is not lost.

DRAFT

DRAFT

1.6 Offerors shall submit their proposals to the US Army Corps of Engineers, 10 S. Howard St., Suite 7000, Baltimore, MD 21203-1715 no later than the time and date specified on Standard Form 1442, Block 13.

2. EVALUATION PROCESS

2.1 Proposal Compliance Review. This review will assure that all required forms and certifications are complete and that the technical and price proposals have been received.

2.2 Technical Proposals. Technical proposals will be evaluated based upon the following factors. All factors will be rated and are listed in descending order of importance. In addition, to the ratings of each factor, an overall evaluation of risk for Corporate Experience and Past Performance (combined), will be made.

Factor 1 - Corporate Experience

Factor 2 - Past Performance

Factor 3 - Organizational Business Management Plan

Factor 4 – Geographic Preference Related to BRAC

Factor 5 – Approved Cost Accounting System

2.3 Price. The Government will evaluate separately and simultaneous to the technical/quality evaluation. Price will not be scored, but will be examined for realism, reasonableness compared to both the Government estimate and other offerors.

2.4 Trade-off Analysis: After all above evaluations are complete, the Source Selection Advisory Council (SSAC) will then consider all factors to determine which offeror has the proposal that represents the best value to the Government. The Government intends to award a contract to the offeror offering the most advantageous proposal to the Government considering that all the Technical Evaluation Factors when combined are significantly more important than price.

2.5 Offerors are advised that it is the intent of the Government that an award will be made without discussions. However, the Government reserves the right to hold discussions if it determines that discussions are necessary. Therefore, proposals should be submitted on the most favorable terms that the offeror can submit to the Government. Do not assume you will be contacted or afforded an opportunity to clarify, discuss, or revise your proposal.

2.6 Offerors submitting proposals for this project should limit submissions to data essential for evaluation of proposals. However, in order to be effectively and equitably evaluated, the proposals must include information sufficiently detailed to clearly describe the offeror's experience, technical approach and management capabilities to successfully complete the project. Requirements stated in this Request for Proposal (RFP) are minimums, unless otherwise stated. Innovative, creative or cost-saving proposals that meet or exceed these requirements are encouraged and will be rated accordingly.

2.7 All proposal materials shall be submitted in binders with a table of contents and tabbed section dividers. The sections shall parallel the submission requirements identified.

DRAFT

DRAFT

3. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

a. All proposals and documentation, which have been properly submitted, will be evaluated. Proposals received will be evaluated on the basis of the factors stated in the solicitation to select the responsible offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the Government. Because of the number of proposals anticipated, uniformity of all proposals is essential to assure fair and accurate evaluation. All proposals must comply with the instructions in the solicitation. After receipt of proposals, the contractor will be required to use all key personnel submitted for evaluation unless at the sole discretion of the Contracting Officer, written consent to an equal or better replacement. Usage of all proposed key personnel will be verified prior to contract award; any changes in identified personnel will be evaluated by the Source Selection Board and could affect potential for being awarded the contract.

b. Information obtained from owners, contract administrators, or other points of contact, provided by the offeror may affect the evaluation rating given for the factors being evaluated.

c. Evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the Tradeoff Process, FAR Part 15. Volume 1, (Technical) Tabs 1 through 5 will be rated using an adjectival methodology with a narrative assessment. Proposal evaluation is an assessment of the proposal and the offeror's ability to perform the resultant contract successfully. Proposals will be evaluated to determine ratings supported by narratives, and to identify strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies of the proposed approach in each proposal.

Volume 2 (Price) will be evaluated independently of the Technical proposal. The price submitted for the pre-construction services and ceiling price shall be evaluated using price analysis techniques. The price submitted as the initial target for the construction phase option shall be evaluated using cost realism analysis techniques. An overall risk assessment of price and cost factors will be performed.

d. Subcontracting. Volume 3 will be reviewed by the Small Business Evaluation Committee (SBEC) established by the SSA. The Subcontracting Plan is part of the Source Selection Process and will be rated on a "go, no-go" basis in accordance with AFARS Appendix DD. Large business concerns must submit their subcontracting projections for this project as part of their proposal.

4. BASIS FOR AWARD

This is a best value trade-off. All technical factors when combined are significantly more important than price. Offerors who can demonstrate project experience that encompasses all factors and sub-factors described in this solicitation will be evaluated more favorably than Offerors who cannot. For example, Contractors who have a proven capability of being able to perform both pre-construction and construction services to successfully deliver large complex projects may receive the highest overall rating. The factors and sub-factors listed below provide a more in-depth understanding of performance expectations for this project.

Offerors are cautioned that the award may not necessarily be made to the lowest price offered. For the order of importance of the factors and sub factors, see the table below.

DRAFT

DRAFT

Table 1

Factor	Factor/Subfactor Description	Relative Importance
Factor 1	Corporate Experience (a) Complex Building Construction (b) Pre-Construction Services (c) Local Market Knowledge	1 st
Factor 2	Past Performance (a) Quality of Product Service (b) Customer Satisfaction (c) Timeliness of Performance (d) Financial Management (e) Utilization of Small Business Concerns	2 nd
Factor 3	Organization Business Management Plan (a) Pre-Construction Services Management Plan (b) Construction Management Plan	3rd
Factor 4	Geographic Preference Related to BRAC (specific criteria to be developed)	4th
Factor 5	Approved Cost Accounting System	5th

5. PART I - TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS:

- a. The Technical proposal shall address the Offeror's proposed approach to fully perform the requirements of the RFP. Offerors are discouraged from providing information not required by the solicitation.
- b. The Offeror shall address each of the following Factors, in sufficient detail to permit a complete and comprehensive evaluation.
- c. Any deviation from the solicitation requirements may result in the disqualification from further competition or a lower rating of the proposal. After award, the solicitation requirements will govern in the event of a conflict between these requirements and the Offeror's proposal.
- d. The Offeror shall submit a maximum of six (6) projects completed in the last six (6) years (Pre-Construction Services 100% completed and construction 50% or more completed) that are similar in terms of building type and complexity to a highly technical administrative building/campus described in this solicitation. The submitted projects shall show the experience requested in the following evaluation factors.

DRAFT

DRAFT

6.1. FACTOR 1 - CORPORATE EXPERIENCE

6.1.1. Submission Requirements

Offeror shall submit a maximum of 6 projects to demonstrate the requirements of the sub factors. The submitted projects should include three (3) projects where the Offeror provided Pre - Construction Services for subsequent construction work and two (2) projects where the Offeror was the Prime Construction Contractor, either with or without providing Pre-Construction Services. Offerors who can demonstrate experience with a combination of pre-construction and construction services will be evaluated more favorably. Projects submitted should contain elements of each sub-factor listed below. Offerors who submit projects that contain elements of each sub-factor listed will be evaluated more favorably.

Provide the project name, a short description, the size (square feet and dollar value), the owner's name and telephone number, and the date of completion. Information regarding the type and extent of Construction or pre-construction services provided under the contract shall be included. The offeror shall indicate how projects submitted are similar in scope and complexity to the project descriptions included in each sub-factor. If the Offeror is composed of two or more companies (e.g. Joint Venture or Teaming Arrangement) reference paragraph 9 for additional requirements. There are three sub-factors that will be evaluated, as outlined below. The same or different projects can be submitted for each sub-factor. Contractors that have experience with projects with Sustainability requirements, such as a LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) "Silver" rating or SPiRiT (Sustainable Project Rating Tool) "Gold" rating, will be evaluated more favorably. LEED or SPiRiT experience may be demonstrated in any or all of the evaluation factors listed below.

The following Sub-factors are listed in descending order of importance:

Sub-factor a. Complex Building Construction: For this sub-factor, describe your experience in constructing projects of similar type, size and complexity to that which is the subject of this solicitation, as a General or Prime Construction Contractor. A project of similar type, size, and complexity is considered to be a highly technical administrative building/campus. The role of constructor may be from a variety of contract types, such as Design-Build or Design-Bid-Build. The emphasis should be on the capability and performance of construction, and should include experience in project delivery under aggressive schedules. Include the percentage of self-performed work.

Sub-factor b. Pre-Construction Services. Describe projects in which the Offeror provided Pre-Construction Services similar to those that will be required under this contract. A project of similar type, size, and complexity is considered to be highly technical administrative building/campus. Provide a detailed description of your experience in providing Pre-construction Services required by the scope for each project.

Sub-factor c. Local Market Knowledge. Describe your experience with similar construction projects, in the Washington DC Metropolitan region. A project of similar type, size, and complexity is considered to be a highly technical administrative building/campus. Describe your knowledge of and experience with local material markets, subcontractors, and the general labor market.

DRAFT

DRAFT

6.1.2. Evaluation

The Offeror's experience in Pre-Construction Services and Construction Services provided for facilities similar to this project will be evaluated. Evaluation will be based on experiences included in the projects provided in the Offeror's proposal. Higher evaluation ratings will be given for experience on those projects that are similar in scope and complexity to this project and clearly demonstrate a Contractor's capabilities to successfully construct a similar project with similar schedule and budget constraints. Experience on projects approaching the project budget or scope will be rated higher. The Government will apply an escalation factor to each project in order to determine the present value of the project for comparison purposes. Experience on projects that does not approach the similarity criteria identified in paragraph 6.1.1.a will be rated lower than those projects meeting this criterion. Further, such characteristics as size, complexity, and dollar value are indicators of similarity. Projects that are not yet complete may be rated lower than those that are complete. Omission of requested information will result in lower ratings than those who provide all the information identified under paragraph 6.1.1 "Factor 1". In evaluating the similarity of projects, evaluators may examine such indicators as the nature/type of the listed projects. An Offeror's experience as a Prime Contractor will be evaluated more favorably than that for which the Offeror acted as a subcontractor, consultant, or provided only Pre-Construction Services.

6.2. FACTOR 2 – PAST PERFORMANCE

6.2.1. Submission Requirements

The Offeror will provide a "Past Performance Evaluation Questionnaire" to the point of contact and/or the person that represents the owner's opinion of the Offeror's past performance for each of the five (6) projects listed. The Offeror is responsible for ensuring that the completed questionnaires are submitted by the date stated on Standard Form 1442 provided with this RFP. A copy of the questionnaire is included at the end of Section 00110.

Each sub-factor below is weighted equally in terms of overall importance. The Government reserves the right to call all references to verify information provided in the questionnaires. Past performance will be evaluated in the areas indicated in the sub-factors shown. Past performance information may be obtained from other than the sources identified by the Offeror, to include past performance evaluations in the Construction Contracts Appraisal Support System (CCASS). .

Sub-factor a. Quality of Product/Service

Sub-factor b. Customer Satisfaction

Sub-factor c. Timeliness of Performance

Sub-factor d. Financial Management - Adherence to Budget.

Sub-factor e. Past Performance on Utilization of Small Business Concerns:

(Note: Small business concerns automatically receive the highest rating possible for Sub-factor e.)

All Offerors, other than small business, shall submit evidence of past performance in complying with clause 57.219-8, (Utilization of Small Business Concerns) on all federal contracts exceeding \$100,000,000 underway or completed within the past three years preceding this solicitation. Information provided may be relative to any similar utilization on contracts that include this clause, with any federal agency.

DRAFT

DRAFT

In addition, Large Business concerns shall submit their subcontracting compliance on previous projects identified in the Corporate Experience Section of this plan. These should be presented in the same order as in the Corporate Experience Section. If the project was not a Government Project and did not require a Subcontracting Plan, state so, and provide all small business subcontracting percentages for those projects in order to show what, if any, utilization of small business was used on the project.

This description should include: the project name; the contract number; the amount of the contract; the Governmental agency that administered the plan and a point of contact with their telephone number, fax number and email address, if available; a point of contact from the firm which administers the plan internally with their telephone number, fax number and email address, if available; the individual responsible for the administration of the subcontracting plan with their address, phone number, fax and email address, if available; the proposed goal percentages for each member of the Small Business Community (small business (SB), small disadvantaged business (SOB), woman-owned small business (WOSB), HUB Zone business, and service-disabled veteran-owned small business (SOVOSB), along with the actual percentages reached on each project; and any letters/memoranda that document or record subcontracting performance, compliance or surveillance visits. This requirement may be supported by using copies of the U.S. Government Standard Form 294, filled out completely.

The Government understands that Small Business Utilization is collected on a Standard Form 295; however, it is also interested on how the firm performed on each "project" or the information on a Standard Form 294. Therefore, the Offeror should submit its Small Business Subcontracting Past Performance on each of the projects, be it a Government contract or a private industry contract.

Past performance will be evaluated in the areas indicated in the sub-factors shown. Past performance information may be obtained from other than the sources identified by the Offeror, to include past performance evaluations in the Construction Contracts Appraisal Support System (CCASS).

6.2.2. Evaluation

The Government will evaluate the responses from the customers in the example projects identified by the offeror and from which Past Performance Evaluation Questionnaires have been received. The Government may contact customers identified by offeror to assure validity of the questionnaires received. The Government may also contact sources other than those provided by the offeror to obtain information with respect to past performance. Evaluations in CCASS (Construction Contractor Appraisal Support System), telephone interviews, and personal knowledge of contractor performance capability obtained from Government personnel may also be evaluated.

(1) A large number of confirmed negative comments may not result in the offeror receiving an overall rating of less than satisfactory. Negative comments in areas that are not of vital importance to the successful performance of this contract may not result in a rating of less than satisfactory. Conversely, one or only a few negative confirmed comments in areas of vital importance to the successful performance of this contract may render an overall past performance rating less than satisfactory.

DRAFT

DRAFT

(2) During the evaluation, the age and relevance of past performance information; the offeror's overall work record; the number, type, and severity of performance problems and the effectiveness of corrective actions taken will be examined.

(3) At no time during this process, nor during the debriefing, nor after award, will the names of the individuals providing reference information on or about an Offeror's past performance be revealed to the Offerors or to any other party. Offerors may be afforded the opportunity to respond to adverse comments made by references in accordance with guidelines identified in FAR Part 15.3. In this case, comments will be extracted and provided to the Offeror. Copies of the questionnaires will not be furnished to the Offeror and will remain confidential.

(4) During the rating process the SSA may also consider past performance information in evaluating overall risk associated with a particular offeror.

(5) Offerors with no established Past Performance will receive a neutral rating.

6.3. FACTOR 3 - ORGANIZATIONAL BUSINESS MANAGEMENT PLAN:

The following sub-factors, when combined, constitute the Offeror's Organization Business Management Plan. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's plan for Pre-Construction services and plan for construction of the project. The following sub-factors are rated equally in terms of importance.

6.3.1. Submission Requirements

6.3.1.1. Sub-factor a. - Pre-Construction Services Management Plan

Staffing Plan. The Offeror shall submit the names and resumes of proposed staff to provide services listed in Section 01010, STATEMENT OF WORK. The Offeror will provide a summary of roles and responsibilities of the Offeror's staff during the project design, and information provided for all personnel should include education, experience, and professional certifications/licenses, all of which will be evaluated. No change in Contractor personnel submitted in the Offeror's proposal shall be allowed without prior written notification and approval by the Government. For Pre-Construction Services, include key personnel as identified in Section 01010. The proposal should clearly present the credentials of each person. For each person, provide a one-page resume, using the Key Personnel Resume form at the end of Section 00100. Each resume should include examples of project experience (including what capacity the individual served on each project), as well as the dates (month and year) employed on each project in that capacity, and the monetary size of each project cited as experience. Resumes should be listed in reverse chronological order, with the latest experience listed first, and all time gaps on each resume fully explained. Minimum qualifications for key personnel are listed in Section 01010. The Offeror shall demonstrate that it has the necessary structure, experience, and qualified resources within its proposed organization to effectively manage, control, administer and execute the integrated design and construction operations, quality control program, and subcontracts. Offerors that demonstrate previous favorable Construction Manager-at-Risk experience will be rated more favorably than offerors without such experience.

DRAFT

DRAFT

Interaction and Communication Plan. The offeror must provide a detailed plan describing the interaction and communication protocol between offeror's proposed staff and the Government's design agent. The plan should include, but is not limited to, extent of major subcontractor involvement in Pre-Construction Services phase, details regarding protocol for team collaboration and coordination, ad-hoc meetings, and information gathering.

Schedule Management Approach. The offeror must provide a detailed description of the proposed schedule management approach describing how the schedule will be used to manage the design and construction phases. In addition, the offeror will describe how it will implement and utilize an earned Value Management system in accordance with EIA Standard 748 – A. The description should include, but is not limited to, techniques for improving project schedule, controlling delays, and keeping the schedule current.

Cost Estimating Approach. The offeror must provide a detailed description of its cost estimating approach describing how the offeror will create and maintain an accurate estimate of construction costs, and how the estimate will be used to provide feedback to the Government during the Pre-Construction phase and control construction costs during the construction phase.

6.3.1.2 Sub-factor b. Construction Management Plan

This information considers the Offeror's intended technical approach to executing the construction portion of this contract. Limit the plan to ten pages or less (using a font size of no smaller than 12 pt.), clearly but concisely detailing the organizational approach to project management and execution.

Describe the proposed technical approaches to construction of this facility. The Government is looking for ways to streamline construction, manage labor and other resource constraints in an effort to reduce costs and achieve an aggressive schedule.

Generally describe the items the offeror will self-perform to comply with the requirements in Section 00800 for self-performed work.

Describe the time control capabilities and systems to be used to plan construction and how the schedule will be used to manage construction. Discuss internal procedures for handling delays to minimize time growth. The Government is interested in the Offeror's planning and scheduling capabilities.

Provide a key personnel organization chart that clearly depicts the key positions and the names of the personnel, their firm affiliations and their job locations, their job/position title within the organization. For construction services, include key personnel as identified in Section 01010, STATEMENT OF WORK. For each person, provide a one-page resume, using the Key Personnel Resume form at the end of Section 00110. Each resume should include examples of project experience (including what capacity the individual served on each project), as well as the dates (month and year) employed on each project in that capacity, and the monetary size of each project cited as experience. Resumes should be listed in reverse chronological order, with the latest experience listed first, and all time gaps on each resume fully explained. Minimum qualifications for key personnel are listed in Section 01010.

DRAFT

DRAFT

Check to ensure that all required information has been addressed in the plan.

6.3.2. Evaluation

The following sub-factors, when combined, constitute the Offeror's Pre-Construction Services Management Plan. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's plan for Pre-Construction services. Pre-Construction services are defined as services similar to those specified in section 01010.

6.3.2.1. Sub-factor a. Pre-Construction Services Management Plan

Staffing Plan. The Government will evaluate and rate the strength of the organization and the strength of personnel identified in the proposal. The strength of organization evaluation will include an evaluation of the personnel assigned to the project and the ability of the Offeror to provide additional resources for the team if supplemental or replacement personnel are required. The strength of personnel evaluation will evaluate the education and experience of the individuals identified in the proposed package. Higher evaluation ratings may be given for plans that demonstrate the ability of proposed personnel to provide insight into designer of record solutions and construction methods. Higher evaluation ratings may be given for relevant project experience, longevity of experience at the position being proposed, education and experience on projects similar to this project. Higher ratings will be assigned for required personnel identified in Section 01010 where experience, degrees, or registrations exceed the minimums listed in Section 01010. Persons with degrees in engineering and/or construction-related fields will be more favorably evaluated than those without degrees or those whose degrees are in fields other than engineering or construction. Persons possessing licenses and/or professional certifications in the fields for which they are proffered may be more favorably evaluated than those without such licenses or certifications.

Interaction and Communication Plan. The Government will review and evaluate the Interaction and Communication Plan for the degree of detailed organization, and ease of communication between the Government and the Offeror's team. Interaction and Communication Plans allowing for ad-hoc meetings to occur face-to-face will be rated higher than a plan proposing tele-conference for ad-hoc meetings.

Schedule Management Approach. The Government will evaluate the approach for the Offeror's ability to manage, control, and update an integrated fast track schedule and complete the project by the required beneficial occupancy date.

Cost Estimating Approach. The Government will evaluate the cost estimating approach for the Offeror's ability to create and maintain a detailed and accurate cost estimate, and evaluate the ability of the cost estimating procedure to provide accurate feedback of construction costs during the Pre-Construction phase, and control the construction costs during construction

6.3.2.2.

Sub-factor b. Construction Management Plan

The Government will evaluate the clarity and strength of the overall plans and organization and how well it is structured to execute the entire scope of work. Higher levels of self-performed work will be rated more favorably.

Qualifications of key construction personnel assigned to this project will be evaluated. More favorable evaluation ratings will be given for relevant project experience, longevity of experience at the position being proposed and education. In addition, more favorable evaluation ratings will be

DRAFT

DRAFT

given for longevity of experience at the position being proposed. Lower evaluation ratings may be given when replacement of key construction personnel has not been acceptable to the owner or Contracting Officer, or the owner or Contracting Officer was not notified about replacement personnel.

6.4 FACTOR 4 - Geographic Preference Related to BRAC

6.4.1 Submission Requirements

Offerors shall submit a two page plan on how they will identify and commit to the employment of residents from the vicinity of the installations being closed or realigned. The area of consideration or local region is Arlington, Prince William, Loudoun and Fairfax Counties in Virginia; Montgomery, Frederick, Howard, Charles and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland; and Washington DC.

6.4.2 Evaluation

Offerors whose place of business is located in the local region impacted by the BRAC realignment will be rated higher. Firms that commit to utilizing employees and subcontractors from the local region will be rated higher.

6.5 FACTOR 5 – Approved Cost Accounting System

6.5.1 Submission Requirements

Offerors shall submit documentation that their accounting system has been approved by DCAA, or other Federal Agency. If the offeror's accounting system has not been reviewed and approved complete and submit Accounting System Checklist found in attachment 4.

6.5.2 Evaluation

Offerors submitting a recent audit from DCAA or other Federal agency indicating the offeror has an Approved Accounting System shall be rated Average High. Offerors that submit the Accounting System Checklist and indicate their accounting system is approvable by DCAA shall receive an Average rating. Firms that indicate their accounting system can not be modified to become approvable by DCAA shall receive a poor rating.

7. Volume II - PRICE PROPOSAL

7.1. PRICE

The non-price factors, when combined, are significantly more important than price.

7.1.1. Submission Requirements

Offerors shall submit the Price Proposal Schedule from Section 00010.

Offerors shall in addition, submit sufficient documentation to demonstrate their proposed construction phase target cost is realistic and reasonable. The documentation may include parametric estimates, detailed estimates, subcontractor quotations, costs for similar structures or a combination of the above used to develop the submitted target price. The information submitted is not considered Cost or Pricing data, but shall be of a nature to demonstrate the realism and reasonableness of the submitted target cost.

DRAFT

DRAFT

7.1.1.1. Additional Information To Be Provided In Volume 2

Pro Forma Requirements shall be submitted in an envelope labeled "Pro Forma Requirements". Provide original and two (2) copies. This category consists of the following:

The Offeror will submit a cover letter containing:

- (1) Solicitation number
- (2) Name, address, email, and telephone and fax numbers of the Offeror.
- (3) Names, title, email and telephone and fax numbers of persons authorized to negotiate on the Offeror's behalf with the Government in connection with this Solicitation.

The Offer (the SF1442) duly executed with an original signature by an official authorized to bind the company. Include the Offeror's DUNS number in block 14.

Acknowledgement of all amendments to the solicitation in accordance with the instructions on the Standard Form 30 (amendment form).

The completed Section 00600 of the solicitation (Representations and Certifications) and the ORCA certification.

For joint ventures, the information required by paragraph "Joint Ventures."

7.1.2. Evaluation

7.1.2.1 Price

The price evaluation will be based on the sum total of the base bid line items and "Ceiling Price" line item.

7.1.2.2 Cost Realism

The Price/Cost Proposal Schedule and supporting documentation submitted in response to this solicitation will be subjectively evaluated for realism and reasonableness by the Price Evaluation Team (PET). The cost realism analysis will be performed for the target cost, target profit and submitted cost reasonableness/realism documentation. In the event, the PET has reason to question the reasonableness of a price proposal, or has reason to believe there is unbalancing in the price proposal, the PET may conduct such additional reasonable analysis as it requires in order to complete a thorough price analysis. Because the evaluation of the price proposal will represent a portion of the total evaluation, it is possible that an Offeror might not be selected because of an unbalanced, unreasonable, or unrealistic price proposal.

The following items will be considered in this evaluation:

- 1) Completeness. All price information required by the Request for Proposal (RFP) has been submitted.
- 2) Reasonableness. The Government will review the prices and supporting documentation for the construction for accuracy, realism and reasonableness. The contractor must demonstrate, by the documentation provided that the submitted Target Cost reasonably represents the value of the work.

DRAFT

DRAFT

7.1.3. Price Information

The evaluated price and cost information will be reported to the SSA. The SSA will utilize the technical ratings and the price evaluations in preparing its overall rating of the proposals and as to the Best Value determination for selection of successful Offeror.

8.0. VOLUME 3- SUBCONTRACTING PLAN

The offeror shall submit a subcontracting plan in accordance with the provision entitled “Subcontracting Plan Evaluations”, found in this Section 00100. Large Business offerors shall submit a subcontracting plan in accordance with Contract Clauses 52.219-4076 and 52.219-4077. To be acceptable, plans must adequately address the six required statutory elements and provide sufficient information to enable the Contracting Officer to answer affirmatively questions A through H of Appendix CC, Part 2, AFARS 19.705. You may use the attached sample Subcontracting Plan. Percentage goals apply to the total amount being subcontracted. The current goals for the Baltimore District are 50% to Small Business, 15% to Small Disadvantaged Business, 8% to Woman-Owned Small Business and 2% to HUBzone Business. Place the original subcontracting plan in a separate envelope.

9. JOINT VENTURES

Joint Ventures shall submit the following additional documentation regarding their business entities:

- (a) A certified copy of their Joint Venture agreement.
- (b) A detailed statement outlining the following in terms of percentages, where appropriate.
 - 1) The relationship of the joint venture parties in terms of business ownership, capital contribution, and profit distribution or loss sharing.
 - 2) The management approach of the joint venture in terms of who will conduct, direct, supervise and control the project and have custody and control of the assets of the joint venture and perform the duties necessary to complete the work.
 - 3) The structure of the joint venture and decision-making responsibilities of the joint venture parties in terms of who will control the manner and method of performance of the work.
 - 4) The bonding responsibilities of the joint venture parties.
 - 5) Identification of the key personnel and legal address of said personnel having authority to legally bind the joint venture to subcontracts and state who will provide or contract for the labor and materials for the joint venture.
 - 6) Identification of party maintaining the joint venture bank accounts for the payment of all expenses and the deposits of all receipts, keep the books and records, and pay applicable taxes for the joint venture.
 - 7) Identification of party furnishing the facilities, such as office supplies and telephone service.
 - 8) Identification of the managing partner and/or the party having overall control of the joint venture.

Other sections of the proposal shall identify, where appropriate, whether key personnel are employees of the individual joint venture parties and identify the party, or hired as employees of the joint venture.

DRAFT

DRAFT

If one of the joint venture parties possesses experience and/or past performance as a Federal Government contractor or as a Corps of Engineers contractor, that experience and/or past performance will be included as the experience and/or past performance of the joint venture.

10. DEBRIEFING OFFERORS

Offerors are entitled to a debriefing in accordance with FAR 15.505 and 15.506.

Attachment 1

PRIME CONTRACTOR EXPERIENCE

DRAFT

DRAFT

Company name _____

Name of Project/Location _____

General Scope of Project and Relevance to this project _____

Owner of the Project: _____

(Note: If Government Contract, give Contract No. and Contracting Office)

Owner's P.O.C. to include Name, Address and Phone _____

(Note: If Government Contract, give name of Contracting Officer)

Role (prime, joint venture, subcontractor) and work your company self-performed on this contract,
and number of years in this role: _____

Construction Contract Completion Date: _____

Construction Contract Value at Award: _____

Construction Contract Value at Completion: _____

DRAFT

DRAFT

Extent and type of work you subcontracted out by percentage_____

Original Contract Duration: _____

Final Contract Duration: _____

Customer Satisfaction: (Attach awards, letters of appreciation or other honoraria if received)

Lost time accidents and Safety Rating: _____

Success in Commissioning Electrical, Mechanical and LAN Systems: _____

Overall Rating for Quality Control and Timeliness of Completion: _____

DRAFT

DRAFT

Attachment 2

PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SOLICITATION NUMBER W912DR-07-R-00__

The offeror listed is being considered in a Source Selection by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District. This is a request for Past Performance information on a project the offeror has identified as being relevant to this solicitation. This information will be used in the evaluation of the offeror's performance of that project. The following information, once submitted, will be treated as confidential and will not be released. This information will only be used to evaluate this offeror for this solicitation. If the relevant project was a Corps of Engineers or U.S. Navy project, submit the SF1420 Evaluation in lieu of this form.

Information may be typed or legibly handwritten in ink.

Please include evaluation of the performance of the contract based solely on which they are liable. Please do not let factors beyond the control of the contractor that resulted in performance delays or other problems bias this evaluation of their performance.

Past Project Information:

Contractor:
Project Title and Location:

Evaluator:

Owner's Name: _____	
Name: _____	Date: _____
Phone No: _____	Fax No. _____
Address: _____	
Position held or function in relation to project: _____	

The following is a definition of the rating system used:

Exceptional: Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.

Very Good: Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.

DRAFT

DRAFT

Satisfactory: Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.

Marginal: Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified correction actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.

Unsatisfactory: Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were effective.

Ratings: In completing this questionnaire, please circle a letter corresponding to your rating, or NA if you are unable to provide an evaluation for any area:

E=Exceptional, VG=Very Good, S=Satisfactory, M=Marginal, U=Unsatisfactory

Please provide clear and concise narrative explanations (both positive and negative) for your answers. This is especially important for any rating above or below satisfactory.

Please rate and provide any supporting information for the following: (Use additional sheets as needed)

<p>1. The contractor's overall corporate management, integrity, reasonableness and cooperative conduct.</p> <p>Rating: E ____, VG ____, S ____, M ____, U ____, N/A ____</p> <p>Comments:</p>
<p>2. The relationship between contractor and owner's team.</p> <p>Rating: E ____, VG ____, S ____, M ____, U ____, N/A ____</p> <p>Comments:</p>
<p>3. The contractor's on-site management and coordination of subcontractors.</p> <p>Rating: E ____, VG ____, S ____, M ____, U ____, N/A ____</p> <p>Comments:</p>

DRAFT

DRAFT

4. The contractor's quality control (CQC) system.

Rating: E ____, VG ____, S ____, M ____, U ____, N/A ____

Comments:

5. The contractor's performance on delivery of quality work.

Rating: E ____, VG ____, S ____, M ____, U ____, N/A ____

Comments:

6. The contractor's ability to meet the performance schedule.

Rating: E ____, VG ____, S ____, M ____, U ____, N/A ____

Comments:

7. What did the contractor do to improve schedule problems – if applicable

Rating: E ____, VG ____, S ____, M ____, U ____, N/A ____

Comments:

8. The contractor's ability to provide the required work at a reasonable total price.

Rating: E ____, VG ____, S ____, M ____, U ____, N/A ____

Comments:

9. The contractor's compliance with labor standards – if applicable.

Rating: E ____, VG ____, S ____, M ____, U ____, N/A ____

Comments:

DRAFT

DRAFT

10. The contractor's compliance with safety standards and/or number of incidents.

Rating: E ____, VG ____, S ____, M ____, U ____, N/A ____

Comments:

11. Did the contractor receive any of the following: Cure Notices; Show Cause; Letters of Reprimand; Suspension of Payments; or Termination? If Yes, please explain.

12. Would you award another contract to this contractor? In no, please state reasons for not recommending this contractor for additional work.

13. Customer satisfaction with end product.

14. Has the contractor been provide an opportunity to discuss any negative performance ratings? If so, what are the results?

15. OVERALL RATING:

Rating: E ____, VG ____, S ____, M ____, U ____, N/A ____

Comments:

Any Additional Comments:

DRAFT

DRAFT

Attachment 3

KEY PERSONNEL RESUME

PERSONNEL

Name _____

Management Title on this project _____

No. of years: With this firm _____ With other firms _____

No. of years in this position or role: _____

Specialization: _____

Professional Registration (Type and State Registration): _____

Your specific experience and qualifications relevant to this project.

(Use continuation sheets, if needed)

DRAFT

DRAFT

4. ACCOUNTING SYSTEM CHECKLIST

Contractor Name:

Answer each of the following questions as either “Yes” or “No”. All “No” responses must be accompanied by an explanation.

1. Are direct and indirect costs appropriately identified, accumulated and reported? _____
2. Are unallowable costs appropriately identified and segregated? _____
3. Are indirect costs allocated equitably and consistently to contracts and other cost objectives?

4. Are direct and indirect labor costs identified to intermediate or final cost objectives by the timekeeping system and charged to appropriate cost objectives by the labor distribution system? _____
5. Are indirect billing rates acceptable in accordance with FAR 42.704? _____
6. Is cost information for billings based on currently posted accounting data? _____
7. Are subcontractor and vendor costs paid in accordance with subcontractor and invoice terms and conditions and ordinarily paid prior to the contractor’s next payment request to the Government? _____
8. Are contract billings reviewed by management to assure compliance with contract terms and provisions? _____

DRAFT